



Subcommittee No. 1 Education

Chair, Jack Scott

Member, Bob Margett

Member, Joe Simitian

**Agenda
May 1, 2007
1:30pm – Room 113**

Hastings College of the Law (6600)

Nell Jessup Newton, Dean, Hastings College of the Law

California Community Colleges (6870)

- I. Dr. Marshall Drummond, Chancellor, California Community Colleges
- II. Overview of Governor's Budget Proposal for California Community Colleges (LAO) Page 2
- III. Enrollment Growth Page 2
- IV. Basic Skills Page 4
- V. Unfunded Budget Change Proposals Page 6

Higher Education Intersegmental Issues

- VI. Nursing Education Page 7
- VII. Student Academic Preparation (UC and CSU) Page 9

Capital Outlay (6440 and 6610)

- VIII. Long Range Development Planning – Budget Bill Language (UC and CSU) Page 10
- IX. UC Telemedicine Page 11
- X. UC Berkeley Energy Biosciences Institute and Helios Research Facility Page 11

Consent

II. Overview of Proposed Community Colleges Budget (Office of the Legislative Analyst)

Figure 1					
Community College Budget Summary					
<i>(Dollars in Millions)</i>					
	Actual 2005-06	Estimated 2006-07	Proposed 2007-08	Change From 2006-07	
				Amount	Percent
Community College Proposition 98					
General Fund	\$3,669.7	\$4,039.6	\$4,223.6	\$184.0	4.6%
Local property tax	1,802.7	1,857.4	2,050.5	193.1	10.4
Subtotals, Proposition 98	(\$5,472.4)	(\$5,897.0)	(\$6,274.1)	(\$377.1)	(6.4%)
Other Funds					
General Fund	(264.8)	(293.3)	(278.6)	(\$14.7)	(-5.0%)
Proposition 98 Reversion Account	35.6	22.3	--	-22.3	-100.0
State operations	9.2	9.7	9.9	0.2	2.1
Teachers' retirement	82.2	83.0	82.0	-1.0	-1.2
Bond payments	137.8	148.3	187.3	39.0	26.3
Loan for Compton CCD	--	30.0	--	-30.0	-100.0
Compton Loan Payback	--	--	-0.6	-0.6	--
State lottery funds	177.9	173.9	173.9	--	--
Other state funds	13.3	13.9	13.7	-0.2	-1.4
Student fees	344.9	321.7	281.9	-39.8	-12.4
Federal funds	249.8	267.0	267.0	--	--
Other local funds	1,241.7	1,326.9	1,326.9	--	--
Subtotals, other funds	(\$2,292.4)	(\$2,396.7)	(\$2,342.0)	(\$54.7)	(-2.3%)
Grand Totals	\$7,764.8	\$8,293.7	\$8,616.1	\$322.4	3.9%
Detail may not total due to rounding.					

III. Student Enrollment Growth

Current law requires that the state provide a minimal level of funding to support student enrollment growth at the community colleges. Recently-enacted statute (Chapter 631, Statutes of 2006) calls for enrollment growth funding to be provided based on the average growth rate of two populations: 19- to 24-year olds and 25- to 65-year olds. For 2007-08, the change in these two populations is projected to grow by 1.65 percent; an increase of this amount would call for an additional 19,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) at a cost of \$90 million.

Governor's Budget

Exceeding the statutorily-required level, the Governor's Budget provides \$109.1 million in funding to support a 2.0 percent growth in student enrollments (approximately 23,000 FTES). This amount is in excess of the statutory growth rate, but less than the 3.0 percent enrollment growth levels requested by the Community Colleges Board of Governors.

Current-year Enrollments

The current-year budget provides \$102.6 million to support 2.0 percent enrollment growth in general apportionments and 1.74 percent growth in selected categorical programs.

While some campuses continue to enjoy healthy enrollment growth, other campus enrollments are declining. Depending on the campus, there are a variety of factors that could be impacting current-year enrollment levels, including: (1) the condition of the region's economy, either luring students away from campus and into the local workforce or motivating them to return to college; (2) a substantial decrease in the number of "unfunded" student enrollments; (3) the impact of student fee reductions; and (4) the availability of specific course offerings.

Prior-Year Restoration Funds

In addition to the amount available for enrollment in the current year, the Community Colleges budget retains unused growth funding from prior years. These funds (known as "restoration funds") allow districts with declining enrollments to be held harmless for one year and have a period of time in which to recover those lost students. After that one year, if the enrollment slots for which the district is funded remain vacant, the district loses the funding, but it is retained in the Community Colleges' base budget. Districts then have three years to increase their enrollments back to the original level, thus "earning back" or "restoring" that funding loss. If these restoration dollars remain unused by the community colleges at the end of any given fiscal year, they are generally available for one-time purposes such as covering shortfalls in student fee revenue or providing general apportionments to districts.

When combined, the current-year enrollment growth funding, coupled with the restoration funding, will allow the community colleges to grow approximately 5% in the current year with total funds that exceed \$250 million.

Based on Fall 2006 enrollment data, the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is estimating current-year growth of approximately 3 percent; however, it is unclear how much of this increase is due to actual "growth" in the current year, versus districts that are "restoring" past-year declines. Under any circumstance, the numbers are likely to change based on the second academic term, and the Chancellor's Office, Department of Finance, and Legislative Analyst are all working together to establish a better current-year estimate. Staff would note, however, that even under the most optimistic scenario, Community Colleges **will not** grow by the 5 percent for which they are provided funding. As such, the committee may wish to explore alternative uses for the unneeded current-year funds.

Potential Current-Year Action

Barring any action by the Legislature, any unused 2006-07 enrollment growth dollars or prior-year restoration dollars (those that were originally appropriated in 2003-04) will revert to the Proposition 98 Reversion Account to be allocated out in future years for other K-14 purposes. However, under the *Elizier Williams v. State of California (Williams)* legal settlement, 50 percent of any funds reverted to the Proposition 98 reversion account must be reappropriated for emergency facility repairs in K-12 low-performing schools.

In addition to allowing the unused funds to revert (per the above comments), the Legislature has several options. First, the Legislative Analyst suggests tapping these unused funds to reduce the current-year Proposition 98 guarantee (as previously discussed in K-12 hearings held by this committee). This would require action by the Legislature to amend the 2006-07 Budget Act,

before the end of the current fiscal year. Second, the committee may elect to allow the community colleges to retain those unused funds and redirect them for another purpose. This option also requires the Legislature to amend the current-year Budget Act before the end of the fiscal year and reschedule the funds to align with the new purposes.

At present, the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is proposing that any unused funds be retained within the community colleges budget and redirected to a variety of the community colleges' unfunded budget proposals (many of which are discussed later in this document). Potential one-time uses include (1) backfilling shortfalls in local property tax and/or fee revenues; (2) augmenting the amount available for physical plant improvements and instructional equipment; (3) providing funding for mandate reimbursements; (4) increasing funding for technology; and (5) providing resources for career-technical education equipment.

2007-08 Enrollment Growth Projections

For 2007-08, the Governor proposes to fund two percent enrollment growth, a target that the colleges may or may not reach.

In response to the current-year enrollment trend, the community colleges are in the process of reevaluating the amount of enrollment growth necessary in 2007-08. As part of its Fall 2006 systemwide budget proposal, the Chancellor's Office requested enrollment growth totaling four percent (or \$170 million).

In its *Analysis of the 2007-08 Budget Bill*, the LAO conducted its own review of enrollment growth projections and trends and determined that providing funding for enrollment growth of 2.0 percent would be excessive. Given that prior-year enrollment dollars have gone unused, the LAO is recommending that the Legislature only fund enrollment growth at the statutorily-required level of 1.65 percent, citing this as a more sufficient level to meet enrollment demand at the community colleges. Further, the LAO asserts that reducing the amount of funded enrollment growth would free up \$19 million (Proposition 98) for another, perhaps higher priority purpose.

Staff recommends that the committee hold open action on either the proposed augmentation of \$109 million for enrollment growth in 2007-08 or reductions to the current-year budget, pending both the Governor's May Revision and better estimates of current-year enrollment levels.

IV. Basic Skills

The Administration proposes to shift \$33.1 million from the community college's Basic Skills categorical program to the Matriculation program.

Definitions

Basic Skills courses include pre-collegiate work in such areas as elementary mathematics and English, while *Matriculation* provides a variety of services to students beginning when they first arrive on campus and continuing until they leave or graduate. Specifically, these activities include orientation, assessment, placement, and counseling.

The current-year Budget Act (as well as prior Budget Acts) specifically fund enrollments in the Basic Skills program over and above the enrollment "cap" of the district. The growth "cap" is a district-based enrollment ceiling, set annually by the Chancellor's Office depending on the

amount of enrollment growth funding available in the budget. Districts that grow enrollments beyond this ceiling receive no state dollars to support those students. However, in recent years, the Legislature has allowed a district's Basic Skills program to grow beyond their enrollment "cap" by specifically appropriating dollars for this purpose in the Budget Act. These dollars are commonly known as "Basic Skills Overcap."

Current Status

According to the Legislative Analyst, enrollment levels in Basic Skills programs statewide have – since 2003-04 – failed to push districts beyond their growth caps. As such, these dollars are no longer being used for their original purpose. Under control language enacted in both the 2005-06 and 2006-07 Budget Acts, Basic Skills Overcap dollars that are not used to support enrollments in the Basic Skills program are available on a one-time (per Basic Skills FTES) for specified uses by the districts.

The Governor, the Legislative Analyst, and the Community Colleges all have differing perspectives on how these now unneeded Basic Skills enrollment dollars should be used.

Governor's Proposal

The Governor proposes shifting the entire balance of the Basic Skills overcap fund (\$33.1 million) to the Matriculation program, hence, using the funds for an entirely different purpose. The Administration further targets the use of the funds by specifying that \$19.1 million would be used to serve students determined to be most "in need" of matriculation services; priority would be given to high school graduates transitioning to community college. The additional \$14 million would be used to increase the base funding of the Matriculation program.

Legislative Analyst Proposal

First and foremost, the LAO recommends that the unused overcap funds be eliminated from the community colleges' budget and thus reducing the amount of Proposition 98 spending proposed for both the 2006-07 and the 2007-08 fiscal years. The LAO notes, however, that if the Legislature is committed to retaining the funds within the community college budget, it should reallocate the funds, using a block grant format, and target those colleges serving the least prepared students. This approach would allow the selected districts flexibility to choose how the funds would best be spent.

Community College Proposal

The community colleges propose that, consistent with past legislative actions, the overcap funds remain in the Basic Skills categorical program and be allocated to districts based on the current per Basic Skills FTES methodology. Under this proposal, funds could be used for a variety of activities, including assessment and planning, curriculum development, counseling, supplemental instruction, tutoring, instructional materials and the like. Colleges would need to participate in a Basic Skills program "self-assessment", which is a tool developed by researchers to assess the efficacy and efficiency of campus-based Basic Skills programs.

Staff recommends that the committee hold open action related to the proposed funding shift, pending the Governor's May Revision and a better assessment of current and future Proposition 98 funding levels.

V. Unfunded Community College Budget Proposals (Information Only)

The community colleges requested additional funding for a variety of programs that were not approved by the Administration or included in the Governor's Budget. Following is a listing of the several items which were denied funding.

1. Part-Time Faculty Office Hours and Health Insurance (\$12 million)

Funding would be used to provide for the state's share of both the Part-Time Faculty Office Hours Program and the Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance Program. Each of these programs requires a 50 percent local match, thereby leveraging state funds and providing an incentive for local community college districts to pay part-time faculty for providing office hours as well as offering health insurance benefits to part-timers.

2. Career Development and College Preparation (\$30 million)

In prior years, this item was known as Non-credit instruction. Non-credit instruction (also called Adult Education within the K-12 system) includes such courses as Basic Skills; English as a Second Language (ESL); Citizenship; Parenting; short-term vocational education programs; and educational programs for older adults and persons with substantial disabilities.

Current law (Chapter 631, Statutes of 2006) establishes a new subcategory of non-credit courses, now defined as "career development and college preparation" courses. These courses are designed to be a "gateway" for both recent immigrants and long-term residents into higher education and/or the workforce. Current law further defines which noncredit courses meet the parameters of this new subcategory.

Under the enacting legislation, these "gateway" courses receive a supplemental rate per FTES. Regular non-credit courses are funded at \$2,626, or about 60 percent of the *credit* FTES rate (approximately \$4,637). These new enhanced/gateway courses receive a supplement of approximately \$466 per FTES, bringing the rate to \$3,091.

This \$30 million augmentation request was designed by the Chancellor's Office to be the second step in a multi-year process to increase the rate of "gateway" non-credit enrollments to the credit FTES rate. An additional \$30 million in 2007-08 would increase the existing rate by another \$465 per FTES or 15 percent.

3. Restore Support for Matriculation Services (\$14 million)

The community colleges are requesting that the state provide additional funding for matriculation services, restoring funding to prior levels. This amount represents the second year of a two year request which began with a current-year augmentation of \$24 million. According to the Chancellor's Office, the availability and use of these services may spell the difference between educational success and an inconclusive one.

Funding for this program has varied in recent years, with a low of \$54.3 million (for both the 2002-03 and 2003-04 fiscal years) and a high of \$72.3 million in 2001-02. In his 2007-08 Budget Proposal, the Governor includes approximately \$134.4 million for matriculation (of this amount, \$33.1 million was redirected from the Basic Skills program).

4. Increase Ratio of Full-Time Faculty (\$45 million)

The Chancellor's Office is requesting that the state provide funds to help districts make progress towards achieving the current statutory goal of full-time faculty providing 75 percent of the district's instruction.

5. Student Services for Newly Accredited Colleges (\$873,000)

This proposal would provide funding for student support services at new colleges. Under the current fiscal process, newly accredited colleges are not eligible for an increase in base funding support without a budget augmentation specifically for that purpose.

VI. Nursing Education

Background and Recent Strategy

In recent years, the Legislature has taken a multi-pronged approach to addressing the state's well-documented nursing shortage. This strategy has included: (1) increasing the number of students enrolled in nursing education programs; (2) increasing the availability of career "pathways" from K-12 to postsecondary education to various health professions; (3) providing "seed money" for colleges to start up new nursing programs or expand existing ones; (4) encouraging individuals to obtain their Masters' Degree in Nursing and return to teach in college nursing programs; and (5) providing financial incentives for nurses to practice in the State's 24-hour care facilities (including state hospitals, prisons, and veteran's homes).

At the post-secondary education level, the state has consistently been systematically increasing the number of "slots" in nursing programs at the community college level (RN's or Registered Nurses); the California State University (RN's, Baccalaureate degree nurses, and Masters' degree nurses); and the University of California (Baccalaureate degree and Masters' degree nurses).

Community Colleges

The Governor's Budget provides a total of \$25.9 million in ongoing funding for nursing education; \$9 million of this amount is new for 2007-08. Of this total, \$14 million is continued from prior years to support increased nursing enrollments and unmet equipment needs; \$8 million would be used for attrition-reduction services; and \$3.9 million would increase the availability of nursing prerequisite courses (such as anatomy, micro-biology, and physiology). The dollars targeted at attrition reduction may be used by a district to increase student enrollments, if the district has a nursing program attrition rate below 15 percent.

In addition to the ongoing funds referenced above, the Governor has also proposed \$9 million in one-time dollars (current year) for the community colleges to develop five new nursing programs (\$5 million) and establish four new nursing "simulator" laboratories (\$4 million).

Issues

The LAO has raised concerns with two specific provisions of this proposal, specifically, the \$9 million in one-time funding and the augmentation of \$3.9 million to increase prerequisite courses.

The LAO recommends deleting the \$9 million in one-time funds because it finds that the need for additional funding for the stated purposes has not been justified. Staff, however, recommends that the Legislature, which has consistently urged the expansion of new nursing

programs, consider approving the request (pending the May Revision), with modifications allowing the funds to be used for a broader set of one-time purposes.

Both the staff and the LAO recommend deleting the Governor's \$3.9 million request to increase prerequisite courses. Staff further recommends redirecting those funds to nursing enrollments and attrition reduction services. Specifically, it remains unclear how the funds would be used. By one account, the funds would provide colleges with a supplemental funding "bump" for this particular category of courses. However, funding these courses at a supplemental rate would create a precedent of providing differential funding rates depending on the type of course – a funding mechanism which has generally not been supported by the Legislature. Other options include allocating a set amount of money to each college strictly as a monetary incentive to increase course offerings in those disciplines.

In addition to the above-noted concern, both the LAO and staff assert that increasing prerequisite courses is not a solution to the nursing shortage. By all accounts, nursing programs at the community colleges continue to be substantially oversubscribed. Any additional support provided to the community colleges for nursing would be better used if it was targeted to either increasing the number of slots in these programs or augmenting the student support services available to ensure that students complete the program.

California State University (CSU)

The Governor's Budget provides a total of \$2.7 million in ongoing funding specifically for nursing enrollments. These dollars fund a total of 410 FTES in a combination of accelerated Masters' degree programs and regular Masters' degree programs, as well as 35 FTES in Baccalaureate degree programs. Total enrollments for these programs far exceed the numbers referenced above and are funded within the base operations of the CSU. Of this \$2.7 million, CSU is using \$1.7 million to educate a cohort, every three years, of students in accelerated Masters' programs. These "Entry-Level Masters" programs allow a student who previously obtained their baccalaureate degree in a non-associated subject matter to obtain both their RN degree and their Master of Science in Nursing degree during a consolidated three-year period.

Issues

Two issues have emerged with regard to funding CSU's nursing enrollments. First, the LAO and staff would note that the state's approach to funding both CSU and the University of California's nursing students has been inconsistent. In some cases, we have required that the enrollment increase be funded from within the total enrollment growth funding provided annually in the Budget Act. Sometimes we have provided colleges with a supplemental "bump" in the per student rate, other times, we have not. In other cases, we have funded these students "outside" of the university's enrollment growth allocations, and as such, have provided funding that represents the full-cost of instruction. Moving forward, the Legislature will want to consider adopting a more standardized approach to funding nursing enrollments.

In addition to the 445 total FTES referenced above, the Governor's 2007-08 budget would require the CSU to absorb 340 baccalaureate degree nursing students, within their proposed 2.5 percent enrollment growth allocation. Staff notes that, given the condition of CSU's "over-enrollments" (exceeding 6,000 FTES) in the current year, CSU may have difficulty absorbing these additional 340 FTES within their 2.5 percent.

University of California (UC)

The Governor's Budget provides a total of \$1.7 million in ongoing funding specifically for nursing enrollments. These dollars fund a total of 122 FTES in accelerated Entry-Level Masters' degree programs and 20 FTES in regular Masters' degree programs. Like the CSU, total enrollments in these programs far exceed the numbers referenced above and are funded within the base operations of the UC. In addition, UC intends to educate an additional 216 FTES in baccalaureate nursing degree programs, the cost of which will be absorbed within their normal growth targets.

Issues

No specific issues have been raised regarding the UC nursing proposal. However, UC notes that any decrease in the amount of funding provided for general enrollment growth for (below the 2.5 percent proposed by the Governor) will substantially hinder their ability to meet these nursing enrollment targets.

VII. Student Academic Preparation Programs. The Governor's Budget, again, fails to provide any state funding for either the UC or CSU student academic preparation and retention programs. This equates to a loss of \$26.3 million for these programs (\$19.3 million for UC and \$7 million for CSU).

This action by the Administration appears to be consistent with its "*Compact*" with the university systems. The compact requires UC and CSU to provide at least \$12 million and \$45 million, respectively, to continue supporting the most effective academic preparation and retention programs, while the Administration fails to guarantee General Fund support for the programs.

Staff notes that while this action may mesh with the Administration's *Compact*, it is not consistent with prior actions of the Legislature, which has repeatedly restored funding for these programs.

As part of the 2005-06 budget process, the UC adopted a new Accountability Framework for its Academic Preparation programs. Under this new Accountability Framework, programs are charged with meeting broad academic achievement goals over a three- to five-year period. The goals for students participating in these programs include: (1) completing the A-G college preparatory course pattern in high school; (2) being academically ready for a four-year college (not just UC); (3) completing high school (by graduating and passing the CAHSEE); and (4) being ready to transfer to a four-year institution as a community college student. In addition, programs have the goal of establishing and maintaining K-20 educational partnerships.

In its recent (annual) report to the Legislature on Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships, the UC reports that its programs have made increased progress towards meeting the goals outlined above.

At the CSU, Early Assessment Program (EAP) is the primary beneficiary of the state support. The EAP program seeks to improve the proficiency level of entering students by assessing their English and mathematics skill levels while the student is still in high school.

In addition to the above-noted programs, the Legislature also provides funding for the California State Summer School for Mathematics and Science (COSMOS). The COSMOS provides academic preparation activities for 540 high achieving high school students annually in a residential environment. While not part of UC's formal Accountability Framework, student success in this

program has been highly regarded and "graduates" of the program are much more likely to ultimately pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics fields.

The Legislative Analyst continues to raise concerns with how the funds are allocated, as well as the data available from evaluations of the programs. According to the *Analysis of the 2007-08 Budget Bill*, student academic preparation programs are generally supported by the LAO. Consistent with prior analyses, the LAO recommends an alternative approach to funding academic preparation programs. Under the LAO's recommendation, the state would implement a new College Preparation Block Grant program, whereby the Legislature would shift the funding away from the university systems and instead use the dollars to target K-12 school districts with low college participation rates. Further, the LAO recommends that the legislature transfer funding that has been set aside for evaluation and research from the university systems to an external evaluator, in order to better assess the efficacy of the programs.

Staff notes that while the university systems, students, and the Legislature continue to tout the success of student academic preparation programs, retaining state funding to support these programs has turned into a perennial issue for the Legislature. Each year the Administration cuts funding for the programs and the Legislature fights to restore it. While funding for student academic preparation is clearly a high priority for the Legislature, it remains unclear why the Administration continues proposing the elimination of state funding for these programs.

Staff recommends that the committee approve augmentations of \$19.3 million for UC and \$7 million for CSU to *backfill* the reductions contained in the Governor's Budget.

VIII. University Long-Range Development Planning

Current Process

Each campus of the UC and CSU prepare a Long-Range Development Plan or Physical Master Plan that guides the future expansion and development of the campus for the next 10 to 15 years. This document serves as an outline of the campus's priorities, including its academic goals and target or projected student enrollment levels. In developing these long-range plans, campuses consult with the local community in an attempt to develop mutually agreeable expansion plans. However, an agreement between the campus and local community does not always occur. A frequent topic of dispute is how both the campus and community will address potential impacts on the surrounding region.

Legislative Analyst

In its exploration and analysis of this issue, the LAO concluded that there is an absence of: (1) state accountability and oversight related to the campus's development of these plans; (2) standardization of public participation in the local process; (3) coordination with the university systems related to statewide enrollment projections; and (4) campus "fair share" agreements related to the mitigation of off-campus impacts.

In an attempt to address a portion of the above-noted deficiencies, the LAO has drafted Supplemental Reporting Language for both the UC and CSU requiring the systems to report on a variety of features related to campus-based long-range planning. The proposed language is included as an attachment to this document. Staff recommends that the committee discuss the language but defer adoption until the May Revision, pending possible modifications.

IX. University of California Telemedicine Capital Outlay Program

As passed by the voters in November of 2006, Proposition 1D provided General Obligation (GO) bond monies to the University of California explicitly to expand telemedicine and medical education facilities (consistent with the UC plan to increase enrollments in medical schools). The measure specified that \$200 million would be available for this purpose. The Governor's 2007-08 budget proposal appropriates \$199 million, in a lump sum, to the University of California for the broad purposes of the Proposition.

Use of Funds

UC indicates that it intends to divide the funds among the five campuses with medical schools (Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco). Under this scenario, UC would distribute approximately \$35 million per campus. To date, each of the five campuses has submitted a proposal outlining how they intend to use the funds. Davis, Irvine, San Diego and San Francisco all have proposed either the addition of new space or the renovation of existing space to accommodate increased medical school capacity and the telemedicine expansion. Some of these projects would be "matched" with funding from non-state sources. Neither staff nor the LAO have raised any concerns with these specific projects.

At the time of the LAO's Analysis, the Los Angeles (LA) campus had yet to submit its proposal. Since then, the LA campus has provided the Legislature with a partial funding plan. Under the campus's plan, \$19 million would be used to purchase telemedicine-related equipment. Both LAO and staff have expressed concern over the incomplete nature of this request.

Systemwide Reserve

Of the \$199 million, UC would "hold back" \$24 million in reserve for the medical schools to "connect" with regional hospitals for telemedicine services. At present, those dollars are not included in the project costs outlined by the campus. Staff recommends that the appropriation of these dollars be withheld until next year (or later) at which point campuses will have developed plans for connecting with other medical facilities.

Structure of the Appropriations

The Governor's Budget proposes to appropriate all \$199 million to UC in a single sum rather than scheduling the dollars out on a project-by-project basis, as has been the standing practice. Inherent in this appropriation methodology is the understanding that once funding for the project is scheduled in the annual Budget Bill, the Legislature has "approved" the project, including the scope of construction and associated costs.

In order to remain consistent in its approach to both approving and funding projects, both staff and the LAO recommend that the committee amend the Budget Bill and specifically appropriate dollars on a project-by-project basis. Further, staff recommends that the committee bifurcate the funding requests and only appropriate the amount needed in 2007-08, rather than the total amount.

X. University of California, Berkeley, Energy Biosciences Institute

The Governor's Budget includes \$70 million in lease revenue bonding authority for the University of California at Berkeley to construct two facilities aimed at researching alternative energy sources. These funds would be provided in addition to the \$890 million available to UC under the enactment

of Proposition 1D. The first project, known as Helios, would seek to develop new solar energy technologies. Under the Governor's initial proposal, Helios would receive \$30 million from the state to construct a new \$100 million building. The remaining funding would be derived from a variety of federal and private sources. The second project, the Energy Biosciences Institute, would receive the remaining \$40 million. The short-term operations and research functions of the Energy Biosciences Institute would focus on alternative fuel sources and be funded by a ten-year \$500 million grant from the BP (formerly known as British Petroleum) corporation. Shortly after the release of the Governor's Budget, the Legislature was notified that UC and the Administration *combined these two proposals into a single \$70 million request.*

A variety of questions have been raised regarding both the facility proposal presented by the Berkeley campus and the nature of the University's public-private partnership with BP. Specifically the committee may wish to further examine the following points:

- Is the state actually "obligated" to build a \$70 million building to comply with Berkeley's proposal to BP?
- How do these previously separate proposals (The Energy Biosciences Institute and the Helios Project) relate?
- How will this landmark public-private partnership be structured? UC indicates that a contract between the Berkeley campus and BP will not be available until the end of the current fiscal year.
- Is this partnership with BP the best direction of UC's research agenda?
- What protections does the state have in regards to retaining the rights (and hence the royalties) to any commercial applications of research conducted at the facility?
- What "oversight" does the UC Academic Senate have over the researchers?
- Is there an "ethics" committee to address issues related to biofuel development or other types of research and the subsequent commercialization of that research?
- How will UC guarantee more "transparency" if this project were to move forward?
- Why is the Administration proposing the use of Lease-Revenue bonds when a General Obligation (GO) Bond was just passed by the voters in November of 2006 (Proposition 1D) and a new GO Bond measure may be on the horizon?
- Who has future responsibility for maintaining the facilities after the conclusion of the BP grant?

Proposed Consent

- 6440-001-3054. Support, University of California. California Health Benefit Review Program. Increase item by \$1,886,000 per *April Finance Letter*.
- 6440-301-0648. Capital Outlay, University of California. Capital Outlay projects, per attached.
- 6440-302-6048. Capital Outlay, University of California. Capital Outlay projects, per attached.
- 6600-001-0001. Support, Hastings College of the Law. \$10,631,000
- 6610-002-0648. Capital Outlay, California State University. Capital Renewal \$50,000,000
- 6610-301-0574. Capital Outlay, California State University. Minor Capital Outlay \$20,000,000
- 6610-301-6028. Capital Outlay, California State University. Add item per *April Finance Letter* for Minor Capital Outlay. \$7,000,000
- 6610-301-6028. Capital Outlay, California State University. Add item per *April Finance Letter* for Equipment for the Monterey Bay Campus Library. \$4,228,000
- 6610-301-6048. Capital Outlay, California State University. Capital Outlay projects, per attached.
- 6610-302-6048. Capital Outlay, California State University. Capital Outlay projects, per attached.
- 6610-492. Reappropriation, California State University. From fund number 6048, 2006.
- 6610-496. Reversion, California State University. San Francisco School of the Arts. \$9,935,000
- 6870-001-0001. Support, California Community Colleges. Chancellor's Office. \$9,935,000
- 6870-001-0890. Support, California Community Colleges. Chancellors Office. Add item per *April Finance Letter*. \$12,000
- 6870-001-0909. Support, California Community Colleges. Fund for Instructional Improvement \$14,000
- 6870-001-0925. Support, California Community Colleges. California Business Resource and Assistance Innovation Network Fund \$13,000
- 6870-001-6028. Support, California Community Colleges. Facilities Planning, Payable from the 2002 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund \$1,833,000
- 6870-101-0001. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. Add Language to CalWORKS Provision, per *April Finance Letter*.
- 6870-101-0890. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. Add item per *April Finance Letter*. \$235,000
- 6870-101-0909. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. Fund for Instructional Improvement. \$302,000
- 6870-101-0925. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. California Business Resources and Assistance Innovation Network Fund. \$15,000
- 6870-103-0001. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. Lease Revenue Bond Payments. \$59,401,000

- 6870-107-0001. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. Local District Financial Management and Oversight. \$350,000
- 6870-111-0001. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. CalWORKS Services, Foster Parent Training, Vocational Education, and Telecommunications/Technology. \$0
- 6870-295-0001. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. Mandate Reimbursement. \$4,004,000
- 6870-495. Reversion, California Community Colleges.
- 6870-497. Reversion, California Community Colleges, Capital Outlay.

**BUDGET BILL LANGUAGE:
UC STUDENT ACADEMIC PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

Add the following provision to Item 6440-001-0001:

X. Of the funds appropriated in Schedule (1), \$19,300,000 is appropriated for student academic preparation and education programs (SAPEP) and is to be matched with \$12,000,000 from existing university resources, for a total of \$31,300,000 for these programs. The University of California shall provide a plan to the Department of Finance and the fiscal committees of each house of the Legislature for expenditure of both state and university funds for SAPEP by September 1, 2007.

**BUDGET BILL LANGUAGE:
CSU STUDENT ACADEMIC PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

Amend Provision 10 of Item 6610-001-0001:

10. Of the amount the funds appropriated in Schedule (1), ~~\$45,000,000~~ \$52,000,000 is appropriated for student academic preparation and student support services programs. The university shall provide \$45,000,000 to support the Early Academic Assessment Program and the Educational Opportunity Program. It is the intent of the Legislature that the university report on the outcomes and effectiveness of the Early Academic Assessment Program to the fiscal committees of each house of the Legislature no later than March 15, 2008.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT LANGUAGE FOR LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Item 6440-001-0001 – University of California

Long Range Planning. Based on academic goals and projected enrollment levels, each University of California (UC) campus and medical center periodically develops a Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) that guides its physical development – such as location of buildings and transportation systems – for an established time horizon. In order to ensure greater legislative oversight over the process used by UC to prepare and implement each plan (as well as the accompanying Environmental Impact Report [EIR]), the university shall provide the Legislature with the following:

- **Copies of Draft LRDPs.** The UC shall provide the Legislature with copies of draft LRDPs at the time they are submitted for public review. (Before the UC Regents can approve an LRDP and accompanying EIR, a campus must allow time for the public to review and comment on these documents.)
- **Systemwide Enrollment Projections.** The UC shall provide systemwide enrollment projections through at least 2020 by ~~December 1, 2007~~ January 10, 2008. In its report, the university should explain and justify the assumptions and data used to calculate the enrollment projections.
- **Use of Summer Term.** It is the intent of the Legislature that UC campuses make fuller use of the summer term as a means to accommodate an anticipated increase in the number of students with existing classrooms. The university shall report to the Legislature by March 15, 2008, on its efforts to optimize ~~operate the summer enrollment term at full capacity, in comparison to other academic terms.~~ This report shall include data on the number of full-time equivalent ~~full-time equivalent~~ students enrolled (by campus) in summer 2007 and fall 2007, both in terms of full-time equivalents and headcount. In addition, UC shall discuss specific steps campuses are taking to increase summer enrollments.
- **Mitigation of Off-Campus Impacts – Current Projects.** When a campus's enrollment and facilities expand, it can sometimes negatively affect the surrounding environment. In view of the recent decision in *City of Marina v. California State University Board of Trustees*, it is the intent of the Legislature that UC take steps to reach agreements with local public agencies regarding the mitigation of off-campus impacts. Beginning on March 1, 2008, the university shall annually report (by campus) on the status of mitigating the all identified off-campus impacts of each capital outlay project. For each impact, this report shall identify whether a fair share agreement has been reached with lo-

cal agencies. The report should also list any monetary payments made by the campus for off-campus mitigation. For those impacts for which there is no fair share agreement, UC should explain what steps are being taken to reach an agreement.

- ***Mitigation of Off-Campus Impacts – Future Projects.*** It is the intent of the Legislature that UC work with the appropriate jurisdictions in mitigating all off-campus impacts associated with future capital outlay projects. Specifically, funding requests for all new capital projects shall include information on whether the university has reached an agreement with such jurisdictions regarding the implementation and costs of specific mitigation measures.

California State University (6610-001-0001)

Long Range Planning. Each of the 23 California State University (CSU) campuses periodically develops a physical master plan that is supposed to guide the future development of its facilities – based on academic goals and projected student enrollment levels – for an established time horizon. In order to ensure greater legislative oversight over the process used by CSU to prepare and implement each plan (as well as the accompanying Environmental Impact Report [EIR]), the university shall provide the Legislature with the following:

- ***Copies of Draft Physical Master Plans.*** The CSU shall provide the Legislature with copies of draft physical master plans before they are approved by the CSU Board of Trustees.
- ***Systemwide Enrollment Projections.*** The CSU shall provide systemwide enrollment projections through at least 2020 by ~~December 1, 2007~~ January 10, 2008. In its report, the university should explain and justify the assumptions and data used to calculate the enrollment projections.
- ***Use of Summer Term.*** It is the intent of the Legislature that CSU campuses make fuller use of the summer term as a means to accommodate an anticipated increase in the number of students with existing classrooms. The university shall report to the Legislature by March 15, 2008, on its efforts to optimize ~~operate the summer enrollment term at full capacity, in comparison to other academic terms.~~ This report shall include data on the number of ~~full-time equivalent~~ students enrolled (by campus) in summer 2007 and fall 2007, both in terms of full-time equivalents and headcount. In addition, CSU shall discuss specific steps campuses are taking to increase summer enrollments.
- ***Mitigation of Off-Campus Impacts – Current Projects.*** When a campus's enrollment and facilities expand, it can sometimes negatively affect the surrounding environment. In view of the recent decision in *City of Marina v. CSU*

University Board of Trustees, it is the intent of the Legislature that CSU take steps to reach agreements with local public agencies regarding the mitigation of off-campus impacts. Beginning on March 1, 2008, the university shall annually report (by campus) on the status of mitigating ~~the~~ all identified off-campus impacts ~~of each capital outlay project~~. For each impact, this report shall identify whether an agreement has been reached with local agencies. The report should also list any monetary payments made by the campus for off-campus mitigation. For those impacts for which there is no agreement, CSU should explain what steps are being taken to reach an agreement.

- ***Mitigation of Off-Campus Impacts – Future Projects.*** It is the intent of the Legislature that CSU work with the appropriate jurisdictions in mitigating all off-campus impacts associated with future capital outlay projects. Specifically, funding requests for all new capital projects shall include information on whether the university has reached an agreement with such jurisdictions regarding the implementation and costs of specific mitigation measures.

Resolution¹ on the Energy Biosciences Institute
Approved at the Special Meeting of the Berkeley Division
April 19, 2007

WHEREAS the public mission of the University of California, Berkeley, mandates the highest standards of scholarly integrity and transparency, particularly in regard to its relationships with sources of private funding, and given the position of the Systemwide Academic Senate on this issue, be it

RESOLVED, cognizant of the memorial passed and ratified by the Systemwide Academic Senate in 2006², that the Academic Senate instruct the Chair of the Berkeley Division to advise the Chancellor that grave issues of academic freedom would be raised if the campus were to deviate from the principle that no unit of the University, whether by faculty vote or administrative decision, has the authority to prevent a faculty member from accepting external research funding based solely on the source of funds. Policies such as the faculty code of conduct are already in place on our campus to uphold the highest standards and integrity of research. The Academic Senate believes that any intervention on the basis of assumptions about the moral or political standing of the donor is unwarranted.

* * * * *

WHEREAS the proposed partnership between BP and the University of California, Berkeley raises concerns about appointments and the allocation of resources, be it

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate instruct the Chair of the Berkeley Division to advise the Chancellor that an adequately supported committee³ composed of four members of the Academic Senate (the chairs of the Budget Committee, the Committee on Research, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, and the Committee on Academic Freedom) be constituted to serve in an advisory capacity to the chancellor in the initiation and oversight of the Energy Biosciences Institute and similar future endeavors.

1. Notice of a special meeting of the Academic Senate, April 19, 2007 with resolutions concerning university agreements
(http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/meetings/documents/Div_SpecialMtg_0407.pdf/).

2. Memorial passed by the Systemwide Academic Council on September 27, 2006 and ratified by the Assembly on October 11, 2006.

(<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/oct2006/research%20funding.11.06.pdf>)

“The Academic Council instructs the Chair of the Council to advise the President that grave issues of academic freedom would be raised if the Regents were to deviate from the principle that no unit of the University, whether by faculty vote or administrative decision, has the authority to prevent a faculty member from accepting external research funding based solely on the source of funds. Policies such as the faculty code of conduct are already in place on all campuses to uphold the highest standards and integrity of research. The Academic Council believes that the Regental intervention on the basis of assumptions about the moral or political standing of the donor is unwarranted.”

3. Excerpt from the memo of W. Drummond, Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate, emailed on March 21, 2007. (http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/EBI_chron.pdf), itself derived from the aforementioned resolutions.

“Following the announcement of February 1, the nature of consultations with the Senate changed. Negotiations got underway to create a contract to operationalize the EBI. On March 20, VCR Burnside advised me that the chairs of the Budget Committee, the Committee on Research, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, and the Committee on Academic Freedom had been invited to participate in the negotiation of the contract for the EBI agreement with BP. She asked that DIVCO entrust these chairs to provide confidential input to the negotiations. Once the contract was signed, they would be released from a pledge of confidentiality.”

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
2007-08 CAPITAL OUTLAY BUDGET AS PROPOSED IN THE GOVERNOR'S BUDGET

	Governor's Budget Funding	Phase
Universitywide		
Telemedicine/PRIME Medical Education	199,000	PWCE
Facilities (D, I, LA, SD, SF)	40,000	(LRB) PWCE
Energy Biosciences Institute Project (BP Grant)		
Berkeley		
* Durant Hall Renovation	9,970	PWC
Campbell Hall Seismic Replacement Building	6,400	PW
Helios Research Facility	30,000	(LRB) PWCE
Davis		
Veterinary Medicine 3B	4,751	W
Electrical Improvements Phase 4	4,335	PWC
Irvine		
Engineering Unit 3	3,292	E
* Humanities Building	23,977	C
* Arts Building	39,855	PWC
* Steinhaus Hall Seismic Improvements	9,681	PWC
Merced		
Social Sciences and Management Building	37,255	C
Riverside		
College of Humanities and Social Sciences		
Instruction and Research Facility	940	E
Psychology Building	1,612	E
Boyce Hall and Webber Hall Renovations	31,776	WC
* East Campus Infrastructure Improvements		
Phase 2	8,893	PWC
Batchelor Hall Building System Renewal	402	P
San Diego		
Music Building	2,204	E
Management School Facility Phase 2	1,000	P
San Francisco		
Electrical Distribution Improvements Phase 2	892	W
Santa Barbara		
Engineering II Life Safety Improvements		
and Addition	5,000	WC
Infrastructure Renewal Phase 1	252	W
Davidson Library Addition and Renewal	1,055	W
Santa Cruz		
Digital Arts Facility	1,044	E
McHenry Addition and Renovation Project	38,184	CE
Biomedical Sciences Facility	69,370	C
Infrastructure Improvements Phase 2	317	W
ANR		
* Hopland REC Field Laboratory and		
Multipurpose Facility	1,708	PWC
TOTALS	573,165	
General Obligation Bonds	\$ 503,165	
General Funds (GF)	\$ -	
State Lease Revenue Bonds (LRB)	\$ 70,000	

* Streamlined projects

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
FY 07/08 Capital Outlay
Consent List

Item:	Requested	At Issue	Approved
6610-301-6048 For capital outlay, California State University, payable from the Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 2006			
(1) 06.50.066 Bakersfield: Art Center and Satellite Plan, Preliminary plans	387,000		387,000
(2) 06.54.081 Dominguez Hills: Educational Resource Center Addition, Construction	58,359,000		58,359,000
(3) 06.68.123 San Marcos: Social and Behavioral Sciences Building, Working drawings and construction	53,688,000		53,688,000
(4) 06.73.096 Los Angeles: Corporation Yard and Public Safety, Construction	15,133,000		15,133,000
(5) 06.80.156 San Diego: Storm/Nasatir Halls Renovation, Preliminary Plans and working drawings	2,552,000		2,552,000
(6) 06.83.002 Channel Islands: Infrastructure Improvements, Phases 1a and 1b, Construction	47,134,000		47,134,000
(7) 06.83.003 Channel Islands: Classroom/Faculty Office Renovation/Addition, Preliminary plans and working drawings	1,989,000		1,989,000
(8) 06.83.005 Channel Islands: Entrance Road, Preliminary plans and working drawings	1,390,000		1,390,000
(9) 06.83.006 Channel Islands: John Spoor Broome Library, Equipment	3,074,000		3,074,000
(10) 06.84.105 San Francisco: School of the Arts, Acquisition	12,382,000		12,382,000
(11) 06.92.067 Stanislaus: Science I Renovation (Seismic), Preliminary plans and working drawings	1,049,000		1,049,000
(12) 06.96.116 San Luis Obispo: Center for Science, Working drawings	2,707,000		2,707,000
(13) 06.98.107 Pomona: Library Addition and Renovation, Phase I, Equipment	5,863,000		5,863,000
(14) 06.98.109 Pomona: College of Business Administration, working drawings and construction	31,429,000		31,429,000
Subtotal	237,136,000		237,136,000
6610-302-6048 For capital outlay, California State University, payable from the Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 2006			
(1) 06.48.381 Systemwide: Nursing Facility Improvements, Preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment	14,326,000		14,326,000
(2) 06.50.064 Bakersfield: Math and Computer Science Building, Equipment	1,513,000		1,513,000
(3) 06.50.064 Bakersfield: Nursing Renovation, Equipment	221,000		221,000
(4) 06.56.093 Fresno: Library Addition and Renovation, Equipment	6,884,000		6,884,000
(5) 06.62.095 Fullerton: College of Business and Economics, Equipment	6,593,000		6,593,000
(6) 06.67.098 Humboldt: Forbes PE Complex Renovation, Equipment	1,366,000		1,366,000
(7) 06.71.111 Long Beach: Library Addition and Renovation, Equipment	481,000		481,000
(8) 06.73.097 Los Angeles: Science Replacement Building, Wing B, Working drawings and construction	50,500,000		50,500,000
(9) 06.78.095 San Bernardino: Palm Desert Off-Campus Center, Phase III, Equipment	999,000		999,000
(10) 06.90.086 Sonoma: Music/Faculty Office Building, Equipment	1,553,000		1,553,000
(11) 6.98108 Pomona: Science Renovation (Seismic), Equipment	4,475,000		4,475,000
Subtotal	88,911,000		88,911,000
Total Consent List	326,047,000		326,047,000

California Community Colleges

District	College/Center	Project Name	Ph.	DOF Letter Changes	Ph.	2007-08 Amt.	Net Totals
Item 6870-301-6028, Chapter XXX/07 (6028- 2002 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Funds)							
Glendale	Glendale College	Allied Health/Aviation Lab			E	\$616,000	
Los Angeles	LA Valley	Health Science Building			E	\$3,219,000	
Rancho Santiago	Santa Ana	Physical Education Seismic Replacement/Expansion			E	\$69,000	
Item 6870-301-6028	TOTAL					\$3,904,000	\$3,904,000
Item 6870-301-6041, Chapter XXX/07 (6041- 2004 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Funds)							
Contra Costa	Contra Costa College	Art Building Seismic Retrofit	C	(\$2,493,000)		\$0	
San Bernardino	San Bernardino Valley College	North Hall, Seismic Replacement			C	\$17,490,000	
San Bernardino	San Bernardino Valley College	North Hall/Media Communications Seismic Replacement			C	\$7,222,000	
San Bernardino	San Bernardino Valley College	Chemistry and Physical Science Seismic Replacement			C	\$25,237,000	
Item 6870-301-6041	TOTAL			(\$2,493,000)		\$49,949,000	\$47,456,000
Item 6870-301-6049, Chapter XXX/07 (2006 Bonds)							
Allan Hancock	Allan Hancock College	One-Stop Student Services Center			CE	\$15,091,000	
Antelope Valley	Antelope Valley College	Theatre Arts Facility			CE	\$10,404,000	
Antelope Valley	Antelope Valley College	Health and Science Building			PW	\$2,770,000	
Barstow	Barstow College	Performing Arts Center			CE	\$20,225,000	
Barstow	Barstow College	Wellness Center			PW	\$296,000	
Cerritos	Cerritos College	Seismic Retrofit Gym			PW	\$910,000	
Chaffey	Ralph M. Lewis Fontana Center	Fontana Center Phase III - Academic Building			PW	\$883,000	
Coast	Orange Coast College	Consumer & Science Lab Building			PW	\$1,129,000	
Contra Costa	Contra Costa College	Physical/ Biological Science Buildings Renovation	C	(\$8,273,000)		\$0	
Contra Costa	Los Medanos College	Art Area Remodel			C	\$2,261,000	
El Camino	El Camino College	Humanities Complex Replacement			E	\$2,686,000	
El Camino	El Camino College	Social Science Remodel for Efficiency			PW	\$453,000	
Glendale	Glendale College	Laboratory College Services Building			PW	\$2,769,000	
Long Beach	Long Beach City College, Pacific Coast Campus	Multi-Disciplinary Academic Building			PW	\$1,467,000	
Los Angeles	East Los Angeles College	Multi-Media Classrooms			CE	\$15,674,000	
Los Angeles	Los Angeles City College	Jefferson Hall Modernization			PW	\$344,000	
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Harbor College	Library/Learning Resource Center			PW	\$1,218,000	
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Trade Tech College	Learning Assistance Center (Basement)			PW	\$2,303,000	
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Valley College	Library/Learning Assistance Center			PW	\$833,000	
Los Rios	American River College	Fine Arts Instructional Space Expansion			C	\$7,225,000	
Los Rios	American River College	Library Expansion			PW	\$84,000	
Los Rios	Cosumnes River College	Science Building Instructional Expansion			C	\$8,670,000	
Los Rios	Sacramento City College	Fine Arts Building Modernization			C	\$4,922,000	

California Community Colleges

Los Rios	Sacramento City College	Performing Arts Modernization	PW	\$281,000	
Mt. San Antonio	Mt. San Antonio College	Administration Remodel	PW	\$521,000	
Mt. San Jacinto	Meniffee Valley Center	General Classroom Building	CE	\$13,142,000	
North Orange County	Fullerton College	Technology and Engineering Complex	PW	\$3,102,000	
Palomar	Palomar College	Multi-Disciplinary Building	CE	\$41,482,000	
Redwoods	College of the Redwoods	Student Services/Administration & Performing Arts Bldg	PW	\$1,322,000	
Riverside	Riverside City College	Nursing/Science Building	PW	\$1,300,000	
South Orange County	Saddleback College	Learning Resouce Center Renovation	C	\$14,983,000	
San Bernardino	Crafton Hills College	Learning Resource/Technology Center	CE	\$14,506,000	
San Francisco	City College of San Francisco - Ocean /Phelan Campus	Joint Use Instructional Facility	CE	\$38,552,000	
San Francisco	City College of San Francisco - Ocean /Phelan Campus	Classroom/Lab Arts Complex	W	\$797,000	
San Francisco	City College of San Francisco - Ocean /Phelan Campus	Performing Arts Center	PW	\$1,743,000	
San Francisco	City College of San Francisco - Chinatown Campus	Campus Building	PWC	\$41,748,000	
San Joaquin Delta	San Joaquin Delta College	Goleman Learning Resource Center Modernization	CE	\$9,596,000	
San Joaquin Delta	San Joaquin Delta College	Cunningham Math/Science Replacement	PW	\$2,302,000	
San Mateo County	Skyline College	Facility Maintenance Center	E	\$250,000	
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara City College	High Technology Center	CE	\$30,672,000	
Santa Clarita	College of the Canyons	Library Addition	PW	\$454,000	
Santa Monica	Santa Monica College	Student Services & Administration Building	PW	\$1,321,000	
Sequoias	College of the Sequoias	Nursing and Allied Health Center	CE	\$7,823,000	
Sequoias	Tulare Center	Phase I Site Development & Facilities	P	\$1,723,000	
Shasta-Trinity-Tehama Jt.	Shasta College	Library Addition	CE	\$12,094,000	
Sierra Joint	Sierra College	Child Development Center	PW	\$700,000	
Sonoma County	Santa Rosa Junior College - Public Safety Training Center	Public Safety Training Ctr. Adv. Lab & Office Complex	PW	\$298,000	
West Hills	West Hills College, Coalinga	Agricultural Science Facility	PW	\$615,000	
West Valley-Mission	West Valley College	Campus Technology Center	CE	\$16,148,000	
West Valley-Mission	West Valley College	Math and Science Replacement	CE	\$5,243,000	
West Valley-Mission	West Valley College	Science and Math Building Renovation	C	\$18,475,000	
West Valley-Mission	Mission College	Main Building, Second Floor Reconstruction	C	\$20,511,000	
Feather River	Feather River College	Learning Resource Center and Technology Building	CE	\$9,864,000	
Item 6870-301-6049		TOTAL	(\$8,273,000)	\$414,185,000	\$405,912,000

California Community Colleges

Item 6870-303-6041, Chapter XXX/07 (2004) Bonds

San Mateo County	College of San Mateo	Demolition of Seismic Hazardous Buildings	PWC	\$10,907,000	
Item 6870-303-6041		TOTAL		\$10,907,000	\$10,907,000

Item 6870-303-6049, Chapter XXX/07 (2006 Bonds)

Cabrillo	Cabrillo College	Visual Arts Reconstruction (Building 300)	PWCE	\$3,098,000	
Ohlone	Ohlone College	Water Intrusion Below Grade	PWC	\$11,379,000	
Grossmont - Cucamonga	Cuyamaca College	LRC Expansion/Remodel, Phase 1	PWCE	\$2,084,000	
Los Angeles	East Los Angeles College	Bailey Library Modernization/Addition	PWCE	\$10,086,000	
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Mission College	Media Arts Center	PWCE	\$14,035,000	
San Mateo County	Canada College	Reactivation of Academic Facilities	PWCE	\$5,688,000	
West Kern	Taft College	TIL Center	PWCE	\$10,541,000	
Item 6870-303-6049		TOTAL		\$56,911,000	\$56,911,000

Total Use of all Bonds **\$535,856,000 \$525,090,000**